

Message Text

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03684 01 OF 08 051803 Z

43

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 USIA-12

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 SS-15 NSC-10 AEC-11 OIC-04 ACDA-19 H-02

RSR-01 OMB-01 /155 W
----- 117227

P R 051614 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8693

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 380

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 8 VIENNA 3684

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

E. O. 11652 GDS

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: MAY 4 DISCUSSION BETWEEN NETHERLANDS AND

US REPS AND SOVIET AND HUNGARIAN REPS

1. BEGIN SUMMARY. ON MAY 4, SOVIETS, CONVENED SESSION BETWEEN NETHERLANDS AND US REPS AND SOVIET AND HUNGARIAN REPS ON PROCEDURES AND PARTICIPATION ARRANGEMENT. DURING THE SESSION, THE SOVIET REPRESENTATIVES ACCEPTED ALLIED DESIRES AS REGARDS THE WORDING OF POSSIBLE EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS ON CARRY- OVER, AND ON THE POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING WORKING GROUPS FOR DISCUSSION. AGREEMENT WAS ALSO REACHED REMAINING SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03684 01 OF 08 051803 Z

UNRESOLVED DETAILS AND TENTATIVELY, ON TEXTS OF COMMUNIQUE WHICH MIGHT BE USED TO ANNOUNCE PLENARY AND TO FOLLOW IT. SOVIETS SAID THEY WERE PREPARED TO HOLD THE FIRST SESSION OF TALKS ON MAY 10. ON THE BASIS OF DISCUSSION IN THE AD

HOC GROUP EARLIER THE SAME DAY, NETHERLANDS AND US REPS INSISTED THAT SOVIETS SHOULD EITHER DROP THEIR DESIRE TO MENTION POSSIBILITY OF INVITING OBSERVERS OR SHOULD RAISE THIS POINT IN THE CONTEXT OF AN EXCHANGE OF CARRY-OVER STATEMENTS OUTSIDE THE PLENARY SESSION, NOT TO BE INCLUDED IN THE WRITTEN RECORD OF THAT SESSION. THE SOVIETS TRIED TO EXPAND THE FORMULA ON OBSERVERS TO PROVIDE THAT ANY PARTICIPANT, INCLUDING SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS, COULD INVITE OTHER COUNTRIES TO PARTICIPATE AS "SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS" RATHER THAN OBSERVERS. ALLIED REPS REJECTED THIS CONCEPT AND SOVIETS FELL BACK TO DESIRE TO MENTION "OBSERVERS." SOVIETS REMAINED INSISTENT, HOWEVER, THAT EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS ON CARRY-OVER, INCLUDING MENTION OF RAISING POSSIBILITY OF INVITING OBSERVERS, APPEAR IN THE WRITTEN RECORD OF THE FIRST SESSION. THIS ISSUE THEREFORE REMAINS THE SOLE UNRESOLVED QUESTION BEFORE PLENARIES CAN BE HELD. END SUMMARY.

2. MAY 4 MEETING HELD AT SOVIET REQUEST, TOOK PLACE IN THE SOVIET EMBASSY. THE NETHERLANDS ACTING REP (DEVOS) AND THE US REP, SOVIET REPS KHLESTOV AND TIMERBAYEV, AND ACTING HUNGARIAN REP PETRAN PARTICIPATED.

3. KHLESTOV BEGAN THE DISCUSSION BY EXPRESSING HOPE THAT ALL ASPECTS OF THE PROCEDURAL PACKAGE COULD BE TIED TOGETHER DURING THE PRESENT SESSION. HE PROPOSED BEGINNING WITH REVIEW OF UNRESOLVED TEXTUAL ISSUES IN THE NINE PROCEDURAL POINTS. HE INDICATED THAT THE EAST WOULD ACCEPT CHANGES PREVIOUSLY SUGGESTED BY THE ALLIES IN PARAS 2, 4, 5 AND 8, AS DISCUSSED IN THE APRIL 29 SESSION. HE FURTHER SAID THAT THE EAST WAS WILLING TO CHANGE THE PHRASE IN THE HUNGARIAN STATEMENT TO EXCLUDE THE WORD "THE" FROM THE PHRASE "AS THE REPRESENTATIVES OF HUNGARY AND OF THE OTHER SOCIALIST STATES HAVE EXPLAINED." THE US REP INDICATED THAT THE ALLIES COULD PROBABLY GO ALONG WITH THIS CHANGE.

4. KHLESTOV THEN SAID THAT THE EASTERN SIDE COULD ACCEPT THE TEXT OF THE PROPOSED CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS DURING THE FIRST SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03684 01 OF 08 051803 Z

PLENARY SESSION, WHICH WOULD BE LIMITED TO ASKING FOR OBJECTIONS TO THE PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES PACKAGE, NOTING THAT THERE WERE NONE AND RECORDING THE PACKAGE FORMULA. IN THIS CONNECTION, KHLESTOV ASKED IF THE CHAIRMAN SHOULD FEEL FREE TO SAY ANYTHING BEYOND THESE BRIEF AGREED REMARKS, I. E., SHOULD HE CALL ON SPEAKERS? THE US REP SAID THAT THE CHAIRMAN SHOULD LIMIT HIMSELF SOLELY TO THE PREVIOUS AGREED BRIEF REMARKS. KHLESTOV AGREED.

5. TURNING TO SUBJECT OF THE EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS ON THE QUESTION OF CARRY-OVER, KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE EASTERN SIDE WAS PREPARED TO GIVE FORMAL AGREEMENT TO THE CONCEPT OF CARRY OVER OF PRESENT PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURAL

PACKAGE TO THE AUTUMN NEGOTIATIONS THROUGH AN EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS AS PREVIOUSLY DISCUSSED ON APRIL 28-30. AS FOR THE TEXTS OF THESE STATEMENTS, HE HAD TWO POINTS TO PROPOSE. THE PHRASE IN THE EASTERN STATEMENT " THIS DOES NOT PRECLUDE THE POSSIBILITY OF OUR RAISING THE QUESTION OF INVITING OTHER EUROPEAN STATES TO PARTICIPATE IN THESE NEGOTIATIONS AS OBSERVERS" SHOULD BE AMENDED BY REPLACING THE WORD " OUR" WITH " INTERESTED STATES." SECOND, THE WORDS " AS OBSERVERS" SHOULD BE CHANGED TO " WITH A SPECIAL STATUS." AS FOR THE PLACE THAT THE ALLIED AND EASTERN STATEMENTS ON CARRY-OVER SHOULD HAVE IN THE AGREED RECORD, KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE EASTERN SIDE WOULD WANT THESE STATEMENTS TO BE PLACED IN THE RECORD DIRECTLY BEFORE THE CLOSING WORDS BY THE CHAIRMAN.

6. KHLESTOV THEN TURNED TO THE QUESTION OF THE EAST'S CONCERN THAT THE ALLIES NOT RAISE OBJECTIONS OF A PROCEDURAL NATURE IF IN THE PRESENT TALKS THE EAST RAISED THE QUESTION OF ESTABLISHING WORKING GROUPS. HE WISHED TO CONFIRM THAT THE EAST WAS WILLING TO ACCEPT A GENTLEMAN'S AGREEMENT ON THIS SUBJECT, AND PROPOSED WORDING ALONG THE FOLLOWING LINES FOR USE IN A POSSIBLE ORAL STATEMENT BY THE ALLIED REPS:
" THE FACT THAT WE NOW DECIDE ON THE APPLICATION OF ARRANGEMENTS ON PROCEDURES AND PARTICIPATION FOR THE FUTURE NEGOTIATIONS WILL NOT BE USED BY THE EASTERN DELEGATIONS AS AN EXCUSE FOR RAISING OBJECTIONS IN THE EVENT THE DELEGATIONS OF THE SOCIALIST STATES RAISE DURING THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS THE QUESTION OF THE CREATION OF A WORKING GROUP OR GROUPS FOR THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS." KHLESTOV SUGGESTED THAT THE FORM OF THIS
SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 03684 01 OF 08 051803 Z

ASSURANCE BY SIMPLY THAT OF AN ORAL STATEMENT MADE BY THE ALLIED REPRESENTATIVE IN THE FRAMEWORK OF DISCUSSION SIMILAR TO THE PRESENT ONE. KHLESTOV THEN SAID THAT HE HAD FINISHED WITH HIS REMARKS AND SUGGESTED THE ALLIES GO DOWN THE SAME LIST TO INDICATE THEIR AGREEMENT.

7. THE US REP SAID HE WAS PLEASED THAT THE EASTERN SIDE HAD ACCEPTED SEVERAL MINOR TEXTUAL CHANGES. AS REGARDED WORKING GROUPS, HE SAID IT WAS HIS UNDERSTANDING THAT THE SOVIETS EXPECTED THE ALLIED REPS TO SAY THAT THEY WILL NOT OBJECT ON PROCEDURAL GROUNDS IF DURING THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS THE EAST WISHED TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF ESTABLISHING WORKING GROUPS FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS, IT BEING UNDERSTOOD THAT SUCH A QUESTION WOULD BE DECIDED BY CONSENSUS IF NECESSARY DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS THEMSELVES. DID THE CONCEPT OF DECISION BY CONSENSUS DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS CORRESPOND TO SOVIET VIEWS?

8. KHLESTOV REPLIED THAT HE SAW NO NEED FOR MENTION OF

SECRET
NMAFVVZCZADP000
SECRET POSS DUPE

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03684 02 OF 08 051716 Z

43

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 USIA-12

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 SS-15 NSC-10 AEC-11 OIC-04 ACDA-19

OMB-01 H-02 RSR-01 /155 W

----- 117087

P R 051614 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8694

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 381

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 8 VIENNA 3684

CONSENSUS, SINCE IT WAS IMPLICIT IN ARRANGEMENTS OF PROCEDURES ALREADY DISCUSSED, BUT HE HAD NO OBJECTIONS. AS FOR DECIDING THE QUESTION DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS, HE THOUGHT THIS WAS AN UNNECESSARY CONCEPT AND HE WOULD OPPOSED ITS ADDITION. IT WAS OBVIOUS THAT IF THE QUESTION WERE RAISED AND NOT DECIDED BY CONSENSUS

IN CONSULTATIONS IT WOULD HAVE TO REMAIN FOR DECISION IN THE NEGOTIATIONS. THE BASIC EASTERN IDEA WAS MERELY TO GET AN ASSURANCE FROM THE WEST THAT THEY WOULD NOT OBJECT ON PROCEDURAL GROUNDS TO RAISING THE QUESTION OF WORKING GROUPS. FURTHER, HE WOULD PREFER IF THE ALLIED STATEMENT SAID, " THE WESTERN SIDE" RATHER THAN " WE."

9. AFTER FURTHER DISCUSSIONS, THE US REP SAID THAT HIS UNDERSTANDING OF THE WORDING ON WORKING GROUPS SUGGESTED BY THE EAST WAS ALONG THE FOLLOWING LINES: " THE WESTERN
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03684 02 OF 08 051716 Z

DELEGATIONS WILL NOT OBJECT ON PROCEDURAL GROUNDS IF DURING THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS YOU WISH TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF ESTABLISHING WORKING GROUPS FOR THE FORTHERCOMING NEGOTIATIONS, IT BEING UNDERSTOOD THAT THIS QUESTION WOULD BE DECIDED BY CONSENSUS." KHLESTOV CONFIRMED THAT THIS WAS AN ACCURATE RECORD OF THE EASTERN VIEW.

10. THE US REP THAN TURED TO KHLESTOV' S SUGGESTIONS TO INSERT THE WORDS " INTERESTED STATES" AND SPEACIAL STATUS" INTO THE EASTERN STATEMENT ON OBSERVERS. HE SAID THAT SUCH PROPOSED ADDITIONS MADE A DIFFICULT SITUATION STILL HARDER FOR EVERYONE INVOLVED. EARLIER, THE SOVIET REPS HAD SIAD THAT THE PROCEDURES AND PARTI-CIPATION ARRANGEMENTS COULD BE CARRIED OVER TO NEGOTIATIONS. THE ALLIED REPS AGREED WITH THE NEED TO CARRY OVER UNDER- STANDINGS PRESENTLY ARRIVED AT. NOW, KHLESTOV HAD RAISED TWO SEPARATE AND THORNY QUESTIONS. HE SHOULD REALIZE THAT THE QUESTION OF OBSERVERS RAISED POLITICAL PROBLEMS FOR THE ALLIED SIDE, AND THATTHE WESTERN ALLIES, AS WAS CLEAR TO ALL CONCERNED, WANTED TO LIMIT THE FOCUS OF NEGOTIATIONS TO CENTRAL EUROPE, AND WOULD NOT WANT TO INVITE OTHER STATES TO PARTICIPATE IN THESE TALKS. KHLESTOV DOUBTLESS UNDERSTOOD THAT THE ENLARGEMENT FORMULA WOULD SERVE THE PURPOSE OF INVITING OTHER POSSIBLE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. THE ALLIES SAW NO NEED TO ESTABLISH PROVISION FOR INVITING OBSERVERS. EARLIER, THE ALLIED REPS HAD SUGGESTED THAT THE EAST COULD MENTION ITS IDEAS ON INVITING OTHERS AS PART OF ITS GENERAL STATEMENT IN THE PLENARIERS HELD FOLLOWING ADOPTION OF THE PRCEDURES PACKAGE. THIS THEY HAD DONE RELUCTANTLY SINCE THEIR CLEAR PREFERENCE WAS THAT THERE BE NO REFERENCE TO THIS SUBJECT. THE ALLIED DELEGATIONS ALREADY FELT SOME RELUCTANCE ABOUT THE IDEA OF CARRY OVER OF A PACKAGE WHICH THEY FELT TO BE IN SOME DEGREE TO THE BENEFIT OF THE EAST. NOW, KHLESTOV' S SUGGESTIONS ABOUT " SPECIAL STATUS" AND " INTERESTE STATES" WOULD MAKE IT EVEN LESS PALATABLE. IN SHORT, IF THE EAST WANTED TO MAKE A STATMENT ABOUT OBSERVERS, THEY WERE FREE TO DO SO IF THEY INSISTED IN THEIR GENERAL STATEMTNS, WHICH WOULD OF COURSE ALLOW THEM SUBSEQUENTLY TO GIVE THE SUBJECT PUBLICITY AS THEY
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03684 02 OF 08 051716 Z

FELT NECESSARY.

11. THE US REP THEN ASKED WHATTHE SOVIET REPS MEANT BY THE PHRASE " INTERESED STATES." TIMERBAYEV REPLIED THAT THEY MEANT ALL EASTERN DELEGATIONS INCLUDING SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS, SINCE IT WAS OBVIOUS THAT THE WESTERN DELEGATIONS WERE NOT INTERESTED IN THE SUBJECT OF IN- VITING FURTHER PARTICIPANTS. THE US REP REPLIED THAT HE REGRETTED TO HAVE TO SAY THE SOVIETS WERE MAKING THE SITUATION MORE AND MORE DIFFICULT. THE ALLIED REPS HAD SAID BEFORE THAT THEY WOULD NO LIKE THE IDEA OF GIVING ASSUANCES TO THE EAST ON THE QUESTION OF INVITING OTHERS. THESE NEW ADDITIONS PROPOSED BY KHLESTOV MADE THE CONCEPT STILL MORE DISTASTEFUL. WHY COULD THE SOVIET REPS NOT ACCEPT THE IDEA OF TREATING THE SUBJECT

IN THEIR GENERAL STATEMENTS? KHESTOV SAID THIS WOULD NOT BE ENOUGH, AND HE COULD NOT ACCEPT THIS SUGGESTION. HE SUGGESTED THAT DISCUSSION OF THE SOVIET SUGGESTIONS ON " INTERESTED STATES" AND " SPECIAL STATUS" BE POSTPONED TO LATER IN THE PRESENT SESSION. HUNGARIAN REP PETRAN ASKED IF THE PROPOSED STATEMENT WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE WITHOUT THESE TWO POINTS. THE US REP SAID THAT IT WOULD STILL BE UNACCEPTABLE.

12. KHESTOV SAID HE WANTED TO RAISE ANOTHER POINT RELATING TO THE EXCHANGE OF ALLIED AND HUNGARIAN STATEMENTS ON THE STATUS OF HUNGARY. AS HE UNDERSTOOD IT, THERE WAS AGREEMENT THAT THERE WOULD BE AN EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS ON HUNGARY, WHICH WOULD BE RECORDED. BEYOND THIS, THE EASTERN SIDE WAS PROCEEDING ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT SUBSEQUENTLY IN THE COURSE OF THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS THE WESTERN DELEGATIONS WOULD NOT, THROUGH UNILATERAL STATEMENTS MADE IN PLEANARIESN AGAIN RAISE THE QUESTION OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION. HE WANTED IT TO BE CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD THAT IF ALLIED DELEGATIONS DID SO, THE EASTERN DELEGATIONS WOULD RESPOND BY SIMILARLY PUTTING FORTH IN PLENARY SESSIONS THEIR POSITION THAT THE QUESTION OF HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION IN AGREEMENTS OR OTHER MEASURES WAS POSSIBLE ONLY ON THE COMDITION OF COMPARABLE ITALIAN PARTICIPATION.

SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 03684 02 OF 08 051716 Z

13. THE US REP SAID THAT THE ALLIES MIGHT BE WILLING TO AGREE ON THIS POINT BECAUSE THEY WANTED TO PROCEED IN THE CURRENT DISUCSSIONS TO OTHER SUBJECTS THAN HUNGARIAN PARTICIPATION. IT WAS FOR THIS REASON THAT.

SECRET

NMAFVVZCZADP000

SECRET POSS DUPE

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03684 03 OF 08 051737 Z

43

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 USIA-12

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 SS-15 NSC-10 AEC-11 OIC-04 ACDA-19 H-02

RSR-01 OMB-01 /155 W

----- 117153

P R 051614 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8695
INFO SECDEF/ WASHDC PRIORITY
MBFR CAPITALS 382
USMISSION GENEVA
USNMR/ SHAPE
USLOSACLANT
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH
USDEL SALT TWO II

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 8 VIENNA 3684

THEY THOUGHT A CARRY- OVER PROVISION FOR THE PROCEDURES AND PARTICIPATION PACKAGE WAS NECESSARY. IT WAS HIS VIEW THAT THE PROBLEM JUST RAISED BY KHLESTOV COULD BE RESOLVED IF A CARRY- OVER PROVISION WERE ADOPTED WITHOUT REFERENCE TO OBSERVERS.

14. KHLESTOV INTERJECTED TO SAY THAT THE CHANGES HE HAD EARLIER PROPOSED FOR THE EASTERN STATEMENT ON OBSERVERS, I. E., " INTERESTED STATES" AND " SPECIAL STATUS," WOULD NOT BE NECESSARY IF THE ALLIES COULD ACCEPT THE REST OF THE STATEMENT AS IT STOOD.

15. THE US REP SAID THAT IN GENERAL, THE ALLIES VIEWED IT AS INEQUITABLE THAT THE EAST WAS ASKING FOR A FURTHER CONCESSION IN THE FORM OF ALLIED AGREEMENT TO INCLUDE LANGUAGE ON OBSERVERS AS A PRICE FOR A PROVISION ON CARRY- OVER. CARRY- OVER WAS NOT ONLY SELF-EVIDENT FROM THE TEXT OF THE PROCEDURES ARRANGEMENT, BUT CLEARLY IN THE INTEREST OF BOTH SIDES. JUDGING FROM KHLESTOV' S REMARKS,
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03684 03 OF 08 051737 Z

THE EAST WOULD APPARENTLY NOT BE SATISFIED WITH MAKING THIS POINT DURING THEIR GENERAL STATEMENTS. IF THE EAST INSISTED THAT THEIR POINT ON INVITING OBSERVERS BE MADE IN AN EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS, IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE TO FIND SOME RESOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM, BUT HE WANTED TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT THE ALLIED SIDE OBJECTED STRONGLY TO INCLUDING THE CONCEPT OF RESERVING THE RIGHT TO INVITE OBSERVERS IN THE AGREED RECORD OF THE SESSION. IF THE OBSERVER ISSUE WERE TO BE RAISED, THE ALLIES WOULD LIKE TO SEE IT DONE IN ANOTHER FORUM. IN THIS SENSE, THE ALLIES THOUGHT THAT THE SOVIET INTERESTS COULD ADEQUATELY BE PROTECTED IF AN EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS WERE MADE ORALLY WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE PRESENT GROUP. THIS WOULD ALSO PERMIT THE CONCEPT OF CARRY OVER TO BE STATED BY THE ALLIES AND AGREED TO BY THE EAST ON AN ORAL BASIS. HE AHD TO ADD THAT, FRANKLY, AN ORAL ASSURANCE ON CARRY OVER WAS LESS THAN WHAT THE ALLIES WOULD LIKE TO SEE, BUT THEIR WILLINGNESS TO CONSIDER THIS POSSIBILITY SHOULD SERVE TO DEMONSTRATE HOW DISTASTEFUL THE CONCEPT OF INVITING OBSERVERS WAS TO THEM. FURTHER, SUCH AN ORAL EXCHANGE WOULD NOT PREVENT THE EASTERN SIDE FROM MAKING PUBLIC USE OF THEIR STATEMENT ON INVITING OTHER PARTICIPANTS. FOR ITS PART, THE WEST WOULD WISH TO MAKE PUBLIC USE OF THE CONCEPT OF CARRY OVER.

16. KHLESTOV SAID HE COULD NOT AGREE. THE EASTERN SIDE COULD AGREE TO THE POSSIBILITY OF AN ORAL ALLIED STATEMENT ON WORKING GROUPS, SINCE THE SUBJECT OF WORKING GROUPS WOULD ARISE DURING THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS, AND SINCE THE ALLIED REPS MAKING THE ORAL ASSURANCES WERE WELL KNOWN TO THE EASTERN SIDE AND WOULD HAVE THE CONFIDENCE OF THE EAST IN SUCH A GENTLEMAN' S AGREEMENT. THE QUESTION OF CARRY OVER WAS DIFFERENT. THIS WOULD HAVE TO APPLY TO THE AUTUMN NEGOTIATIONS, WHERE A DIFFERENT CAST OF CHARACTERS WOULD BE INVOLVED. THE CONCEPT OF AN EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS ON CARRY OVER AS DISCUSSED IN PRECEDING SESSIONS WAS A NON- PREJUDICIAL ONE AND SHOULD BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD. THIS WAS IMPORTANT IN THE INTEREST OF ACCURACY AND IN AVOIDING POSSIBLE FUTURE AMBIGUITIES THAT COULD OTHERWISE CLOUD THE AUTUMN NEGOTIATIONS. TO SUGGEST THAT CARRY OVER NOT BE INCLUDED IN THE RECORD COULD ONLY RAISE SUSPICIONS OF ALLIED INTENTIONS. TO BE PERFECTLY CLEAR, KHLESTOV CONTINUED, IT WAS THE ALLIED SIDE WHICH HAD RAISED THE QUESTION OF CARRY OVER ON THE BASIS OF A DECISION BY THE NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL. SUBSEQUENTLY, THE SOVIETS HAD WORKED WITH THE ALLIED REPS TO DEVELOP AN IMPARTIAL AND NON- PREJUDICIAL RESOLUTION

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03684 03 OF 08 051737 Z

ON THIS QUESTION. THIS HAD BEEN DONE WITH THE UNDERSTANDING ON THE SOVIET SIDE THAT THE RESULT WOULD BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD. THE EASTERN POSITION WAS THAT THE STATEMENTS HAD TO BE PART OF THE RECORD, AND THIS COULD NOT BE CHANGED.

17. THE US REP SAID HE COULD READILY UNDERSTAND KHLESTOV' S DESIRE THAT A CARRY- OVER PROVISION SHOULD BE MADE IN WRITING AS PART OF THE RECORD. WHAT THE ALLIES DID NOT LIKE WAS INCLUDING THE EASTERN IDEA OF INVITING OTHER COUNTRIES. HE DID NOT SEE HOW THE EASTERN RIGHT TO RAISE THIS SUBJECT COULD BE PREJUDICED BY AN AGREEMENT TO CARRY OVER PROCEDURES AND PARTICIPATION ARRANGEMENTS WHICH IN THEMSELVES CONTAINED CLEARLY DEFINED GROUND RULES FOR RAISING NEW SUBJECT MATTER AND FOR FURTHER CHANGES. THE ALLIES WOULD BE SATISFIED WITH EASTERN ASSURANCES THAT THEY WOULD HONOR THE CONCEPT OF CARRY OVER. THE EAST SHOULD BE WILLING TO TAKE THE ALLIES' WORK ON THE QUESTION OF RAISING THE MATTER OF OBSERVERS. EASTERN INTERESTS WOULD BE COVERED, AND THE EAST COULD MAKE PUBLIC REFERENCE TO THIS UNDERSTANDING AS IT WISHED. IN SHORT, AN EXCHANGE OF ORAL STATEMENTS WAS A REASONABLE AND SIMPLE WAY TO DEAL WITH THE MATTER.

18. KHLESTOV SAID THIS WOULD NOT WORK. HE REPEATED THAT HE AGREED THAT AGREEMENTS THUS FAR TENTATIVELY REACHED ON PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES ARRANGEMENTS SHOULD BE FIXED IN THE FORM OF A DOCUMENT OR A RECORD FOR THE SAKE OF CLARITY. IF A PROVISION FOR CARRY OVER WERE PART OF THESE ARRANGEMENTS, IT MUST BE A PART OF THE RECORD. THE COMPLEMENT TO THIS PROPOSED BY THE EAST, I. E., THE RIGHT TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF OTHER PARTICIPANTS, WAS ESSENTIAL TO PROTECT THE INTERESTS OF THE SOCIALIST STATES SO THAT IT COULD NOT LATER BE SAID THIS POSSIBILITY WAS EXCLUDED BY THE PROCEDURES AGREEMENT. IT IN NO WAY COMMITTED OR COMPROMISED THE WESTERN DELEGA-

TIONS. THE DECISION ON THE OBSERVER ISSUE WOULD BE TAKEN BY CONSENSUS AND THE SOVIETS KNEW THE WEST WOULD OOOPOSE IT. BUT, IT HAD TO BE PART OF THE RECORD.

SECRET

NMAFVVZCZADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03684 04 OF 08 051943 Z

72

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 USIA-12

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 SS-15 NSC-10 AEC-11 OIC-04 ACDA-19 H-02

RSR-01 OMB-01 /155 W

----- 117534

P 051703 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8696

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 383

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR/ SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

S E C R E T SECTION 4 OF 8 VIENNA 3684

DURING THREE PRECEDING DIFFICULT SESSIONS, THE EASTERN SIDE HAD SOUGHT TO COMPROMISE. THEY NOW REGRETTED IF THE WESTERN DELEGATIONS WERE NOT IN A POSITION TO AGREE, AND IF THIS WAS THE CASE, THEN IT WAS THE WESTERN DELEGATES WHO WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY FURTHER DELAYS THAT MIGHT RESULT.

19. THE US REP SAID THAT, PERSONALLY, HE WOULD AGREE IN PRINCIPLE THAT THE EASTERN SIDE'S POSSIBILITY TO RAISE THE OBSERVER ISSUE WAS NOT PRECLUDED BY THE PROCEDURAL AGREEMENTS. FURTHER, HE WOULD BE WILLING TO CONSIDER MENTION OF THIS POINT IN SOME FORM, PERHAPS EVEN BY THE ALLIES IN CONNECTION WITH THEIR ORAL STATEMENT ON WORKING GROUPS, SHORT OF A FORMAL EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS FOR SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03684 04 OF 08 051943 Z

THE WRITTEN RECORD. BUT IT SHOULD BE CLEAR TO THE EASTERN SIDE THAT THE ALLIED SIDE HAD A BASIC OBJECTION ON A POINT OF PRINCIPLE, WHICH WAS THE EASTERN EFFORT TO ADD AN ADDITIONAL FEATURE TO AN UNDERSTANDING WHICH, AS WAS OBVIOUS TO EVERYONE, SHOULD BE APPLIED

TO THE NEGOTIATIONS. THE EASTERN IDEA OF RAISING THE OBSERVERS ISSUE HAD NO NECESSARY CONNECTION WITH THE PROCEDURAL AGREEMENTS. THE ALLIES OBJECTED AS A POINT OF PRINCIPLE TO PAYING AN ADDITIONAL PRICE FOR AN OBVIOUS AND MUTUALLY DESIRABLE PROVISION ON CARRY OVER.

20. US REP SAID THAT AS FOR THE PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS WHICH KHLESTOV HAD MENTIONED, THE US AND NETHERLANDS REPS HAD AT THE TIME MADE VERY CLEAR THAT THIS WAS POSITIVELY NOT COVERED IN THEIR MANDATE FROM THEIR ALLIED COLLEAGUES AND THAT THEY WERE DISCUSSING THE SUBJECT OF AN EXCHANGE STATEMENT ON CARRY- OVER ON A PURELY PERSONAL BASIS WITH NO ASSURANCE THAT A SOLUTION SLOG THE LINES OF COMPLEMENTARY STATEMENTS ON THIS SUBJECT WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO THE ALLIES.

21. THE NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT HE WISHED TO UNDERSCORE WHAT THE US REP HAD SAID. THE ALLIES CONSIDERED THE ARRANGEMENTS ON PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES AS A PACKAGE. THEY HAD MADE CLEAR IN PREVIOUS MEETINGS THAT THEY THOUGHT THAT THE CARRY- OVER OF THESE ARRANGEMENTS TO THE NEGOTIATIONS WAS AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE PACKAGE. THE EASTERN EFFORT TO INTRODUCE INTO THE EQUATION THE QUESTION OF OBSERVERS REPRESENTED ADDING A NEW ELEMENT WHICH IT MUST BE OBVIOUS TO THE EAST REPRESENTED A POLITICAL ISSUE FOR THE ALLIES. BOTH SIDES HAD VIEWS ON THIS QUESTION, WHICH WAS NOT ONLY A COMPLICATED QUESTION INTRINSICALLY, BUT ALSO ONE WHICH RELATED TO CSCE

AND HAD WIDE RANGING IMPLICATIONS. IF THE EASTERN SIDE WISHED TO RECORD ITS VIEWS ON INVITING OBSERVERS DURING THE FIRST PLENARY, THIS WOULD BE A ONE- SIDED PRESENTATION OF AN ISSUE ON WHICH BOTH SIDES HAD VIEWS, AND ON WHICH BOTH SIDES NATURALLY WISHED TO PRESERVE THEIR OWN INTERESTS. IN THIS CONTEXT, THE LOGICAL WAY TO PRESERVE THE INTERESTS OF BOTH SIDES WOULD BE FOR THE ALLIES ALSO TO STATE THEIR VIEWS IN THE FIRST PLENARY. BUT TO DO THIS WOULD OBVIOUSLY COMPLICATE THE WHOLE FOCUS OF THE FIRST PLENARY, BORADEN ITS SUBJECT MATTER, AND GO CONSIDERABLY BEYOND THE SCOPE EARLIER ENVISAGED. IN SHORT, THIS WAS NOT A GOOD SOLUTION. THE NETHERLANDS REP UNDERSCORED THAT IF THE EASTERN SIDE INSISTED ON
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03684 04 OF 08 051943 Z

LINKING THE QUESTION OF CARRY- OVER WITH OBSERVERS, SOME OTHER WAY WOULD HAVE TO BE FOUND TO DO THIS, THROUGHT STATEMENTS WHICH WOULD NOT BE PART OF THE RECORD OF FIRST PLENARY. TO THIS END, AN ORAL EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE PRESENT GROUP WAS A REASONABLE SOLUTION.

22. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE ALLIED REPS WERE MAKING THE WHOLE SITUATION MORE AND MORE DIFFICULT. IF THE EASTERN SIDE SHOULD AGREE TO ACCEPT A PROCEDURAL ARRANGEMENT WHICH BEGAN BY LISTING NINETEEN PARTICIPANTS, THIS WOULD REFLECT ONLY THE WESTERN VIEW- POINT. FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE PRESENT TALKS THE EAST HAD INSISTED THAT OTHER EUROPEAN PARTICIPANTS SHOULD BE INVITED. IF THE PROCEDURAL ARRANGEMENT WERE ACCEPTED WITHOUT MENTION OF OBSERVERS,

THE ALLIED REPS COULD USE THIS FACT AGAINST THE EAST IN THE FUTURE TO RULE OUT OF ORDER ANY ATTEMPT TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF INVITING OTHERS. IN SHORT, THE PRESENT PROCEDURAL AND PARTICIPATION ARRANGEMENTS CLEARLY REFLECTED THE WESTERN POSITION AND ONLY THE WESTERN POSITION ON THE OVERALL SUBJECT OF PARTICIPATION. THE EAST HAD TO RESERVE ITS RIGHT TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF INVITING OTHERS, AND COULD AGREE TO THE IDEAS OF A

SECRET

NMAFVVZCZADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03684 05 OF 08 051832 Z

44

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 USIA-12

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 SS-15 NSC-10 AEC-11 OIC-04 ACDA-19 H-02

RSR-01 OMB-01 /155 W

----- 117310

P R 051614 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8697

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 384

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

S E C R E T SECTION 5 OF 8 VIENNA 3684

CARRY- OVER FORMULA ONLY IN THE CONTEXT OF RESERVING THIS RIGHT.

AGAINST THIS BACKGROUND, IT WAS WHOLLY UNREASONABLE FOR THE ALLIED REPS TO SAY THEY WERE BEING ASKED TO PAY TWICE FOR SOMETHING..

23. THE US REP SAID THAT IT WAS APPARENT THAT THE WESTERN SIDE HAD THE SAME TYPE OF CONCERN ABOUT THE QUESTION OF OBSERVERS AS IT HAD WITH THE ISSUE OF WORKING GROUPS-- THE CONCERN THAT THE ALLIED REPS MIGHT SEEK TO RULE OUT DISCUSSION OF THESE SUBJECTS ON A PROCEDURAL BASIS. SINCE BOTH ISSUES WERE OBVIOUSLY OF THE SAME TYPE WHY WAS IT NOT POSSIBLE TO DEAL WITH BOTH IN THE SAME EXCHANGE OF ORAL STATEMENTS? SPEAKING PERSONALLY, BE THOUGHT THAT IF THIS WOULD RESOLVE THE PROBLEM IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE FOR THE ALLIES TO CONSIDER INCLUDING IN THEIR ORAL STATEMENT THAT THE PROCEDURES ARRANGEMENTS DID NOT PRECLUDE MENTION OF WORKING GROUPS OR SOME MENTION OF OBSERVERS

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03684 05 OF 08 051832 Z

IN THIS CONNECION. KHLESTOV RESPONDED THAT THE IDEA OF WORKING GROUPS AND OBSERVERS WERE DIFFERENCT. AS HE HAD EXPLAINED, THE CONCEPT OF CARRY- OVER WAS RELATED TO THE AUTUMN NEGOTIATIONS. THE WORKING GROUP POINT WAS A MATTER FOR THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS. THE US REP REPEATED THAT THE CONCERN EXPRESSED BY THE SOVIETS ON BOTH THESE SUBJECTS WAS A SIMILAR ONE. BOTH ISSUES SHOULD BE HANDLED THE SAME WAY. THE LOGICAL WAY TO PROCEED WOULD BE TO INCORPORATE A SHORT POINT IN THE CHAIRMAN' S REMARKS ABOUT CARRY- OVER PROVISIONS, AND THEN TO HAVE AN EXCHANGE OF ORAL STATEMENTS OUTSIDE THE FRAMEWORK OF THE PLEANARY IN WHICH EITHER ALLIED OR EWATERN SPOKESMAN WOULD MENTION THE THEMES OF NOT PRECLUDING FURHTER DISCUSSION OF WORKING GROUPS OR OF OBSERVERS ON PROCEDURAL GROUNDS. FURTHER, AS HE HAD EALIER SAID, THE ALLIES WOULD UNDERSTAND IT IF THE SOVIETS THEN SOUGHT TO MAKE SOME PUBLIC REFERENCE TO THESE STATMENTS.

24. KHLESTOV SAID THE SITUATION WAS INDEED BECOMING COMPLICATED. HE HAD THOUGHT THAT THE EASTERN SIDE HAD MADE SOME REAL CONCESSION AND HAD WORKED AT COMPROMISE. HE HAD HAD A HARD TIME ON THE PACKAGE IWTH HIS EASTERN COLLEAGUES. THE WAY OF HANDLING THE OBSERVERS ISSUE DISCUSSED IN THE THREE PRECEEDING SESSIONS CONSTITUTED NEUTRAL SOLUTIONS. IF THE ALLIED DELEGATIONS COULD NOT ACCEPT THIS SOLUTION, THEN THE ONUS FOR FUTURE DELAYS WOULD BE ON THEM. KHLESTOV SAID THAT, AS FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE PRESENT SESSION IT COULD CLOSE AT THIS POINT AND COULD SIMPLY WAIT TO HEAR FURTHER VIEWS FROM THE ALLIES; OR THE DISCUSSION COULD MOVE ON TO OTHER OPEN QUESTIONS BEOFRE THE GROUP.

25. THE US REP SUGGESTED THAT DISCUSSION TURN AGAIN TO THE QUESTION OF WORKING GROUPS. THE ALLIED REPS COULD MAKE A STATEMENT ALONG THE LINES EARLIER ENVISAGED, BUT FOR THE SAKE OF CLARITY, AND SO THAT THE POSSIBILITY THAT THE QUESTION OF WORKING GROUPS COULD NOT BE RESOLVED IN THE COURSE OF THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS WOULD NOT BE USED BY THE EAST TO BLOCK DISCUSSIONS OF OTHER SUBJECTS, HE SUGGESTED IN ADDITION TO THE ALLIED STATEMENTS ALONG THE FOLLOWING LINES: " IT BEING UNDERSTODDY THAT THIS QUESTION WOULD BE DICED BY CONSENSUS, EITHER IN THESE CONSULTATIONS OR IN NEGOTIATIONS." THIS PHRASING WOULD SERVE TO CARRY- OVER ANY QUESTION OF WORKING GROUPS WHICH MIGHT BE RAISED TO THE NEGOTIATIONS IF IT

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03684 05 OF 08 051832 Z

WERE UNRESOLVED IN CONSULTATIONS.

26. THE US REP THEN SAID THAT, THE TWO SIDES HAVING ENCHANGED THEIR VIEWS ON THE WAY IN WHICH STATEMENTS ON CARRY OVER SHOULD BE MADE, IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO LEAVE THIS QUESTION ASIDE AND CONCENTRATE

ON THE TEXTS OF SUCH POSSIBLE STATEMENTS. HE THEN SUGGESTED, INSTEAD, A TEXT OF THE ALLIED STATEMENT, SLIGHTLY REVISED FOR USE IN AN ORAL EXCHANGED, AS FOLLOWS:

27. " IT IS UNDERSTOOD THAT THE ARRANGEMENT ON PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES BEING ADOPTED TODAY WILL ALSO BE APPLIED IN THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS WITHOUT FURTHER REQUIREMENTS OR CONDITIONS ON EITHER SIDE. HOWEVER, WE WILL NOT OBJECT ON PROCEDURAL GROUNDS IF DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS YOU WISH TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF ESTABLISHING WORKING GROUPS FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS, IT BEING UNDERSTOOD THAT SUCH A QUESTION WOULD BE DECIDED IN THE NEGOTIATIONS BY CONSENSUS." A COMPARABLE EASTERN STATEMENT ALSO MENTIONING OBSERVERS MIGHT BE MADE. HE HAD PROPOSED THE PHRASE " WITHOUT FURTHER REQUIREMENTS OR CONDITIONS ON EITHER SIDE" TO ACHIEVE ABSOLUTE CLARITY ON THE CARRY OVE ISSUE WITH NO REPETITION OF CURRENT DIFFICULTIES. THIS PHRASE WOULD REPLACE THE PHRASE " IN ITS PRESENT FORM UNLESS ADDED TO BY CONSENSUS" CONTAINED IN THE SOVIET PROPOSAL OF APRIL 30. KHLESTOV HIMSELF HAD SUGGESTED THAT LATTER PHRASE WAS SUPERFLUOUS.

28. KHLESTOV SAID HE COULD NOT UNDERSTAND WHY US REP HAD SUGGESTED THE PHRASE " WITHOUT FURTHER REQUIREMENTS OR COMIDTIONS ON EITHER SIDE." CLEARLY, EVERYTHING WOULD BE BASED ON A CONSENSUS, AND THIS ADDITION WAS UNNECESSARY. THE US REP EXPLAINED THAT THIS PHRASE WOULD ONLY SERVE TO EXPLAIN THE PHRASE THAT " PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES BEING ADOPETED TODAY WILL ALSO BE APPLIED", TIGHTENING THE CONCEPT AND MAKING IT CLEAR THAT THERE WOULD BE NO FURTHER REQUIREMENTS TIED ON. TIMERBAYEV SAID THAT HIS PHRASE WOULD SEEM TO INHIBIT THE IDEA OF RAINING WORKING GROUPS. KHLESTOV SAID THE PHRASE WAS NOT LOGICAL. HE ADDED THAT IF THE ALLIES WERE CONCERNED THAT THE EASTERN SIDE WOULD BE PERFIDIUOUS, THEY ALREADY HAD ADEQUATE PROTECTION AGAINEST THIS THROUGHT THE CONSENSUS MECHANISM. THE US REP SAID IN THAT EVENT, THERE SHOULD BE A
SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 03684 05 OF 08 051832 Z

SINGLE AGREED ORAL STATEMENT ON CARRY OVER, OWRKING GROUPS, AND OBSERVERS MADE OUTSIDE THE PLEANARY. KHLESTOV INDICATED HE WOULD CONSIDER THIS ONLY IF THE STATEMENT ON OBSERVERS WERE TO BE A PART OF THE RECORD.

29. KHLESTOV THEN SUGGESTED MOVING ON TO OTHER UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE FIRST PLENARY. HE SAID THAT THE EAST COULD FORMALLY AGREE TO THE IDEA OF GROPS SET UP FOR THE PURPOSE OF COMPARING TRANSLATIONS, REITERATING THAT TRANSLATIONS SHOULD BE AGREED BEFORE THE FIRST PLEANARY. HE SAID THAT ALL FOUR TEXTS SHOULD BE REVIEWED BY SUCH GROUPS, AND THAT THE EASTERN SIDE ENVISAGED THE FOLLOWING PARTICIPANTS.

SECRET

NMAFVVZCZADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03684 06 OF 08 051848 Z

43

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 USIA-12

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 SS-15 NSC-10 AEC-11 OIC-04 ACDA-19 H-02

OMB-01 RSR-01 /155 W

----- 117343

P R 051614 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8698

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 385

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

S E C R E T SECTION 6 OF 8 VIENNA 3684

GENEVA FOR DISTO

IN THESE WORKING GROUPS: ENGLISH: HUNGARY AND USSR;
RUSSIAN: BULGARIA AND USSR; FRENCH: POLAND AND USSR; GERMAN:
GDR AND USSR. THE US REP ASKED WHAT TYPES OF CORRECTION
MIGHT BE ENVISAGED IN THE ENGLISH TEXT, WHICH HAD BEEN
DEVELOPED IN GREAT DETAIL BY PARTICIPANTS IN THE PRESENT SERIES
OF DISCUSSIONS. KHLESTOV AND TIMERBAYEV SAID THAT THEY
ENVISAGED ONLY MINOR CORRECTIONS OF THE MOST TECHNICAL NATURE,
I. E., OF A GRAMMATICAL OR PUNCTUATION NATURE. THE US REP
SAID THAT THE ALLIED SIDE HAD NOT ENVISAGED PARTICIPANTS TO
WORK ON THE ENGLISH TEXT, BUT WOULD CONSIDER THIS QUESTION
AND LET THE EASTERN SIDE KNOWN WHO THE PARTICIPANTS WOULD BE.
FOR THE OTHER LANGUAGES, THE ALLIES WOULD BE REPRESENTED BY:
RUSSIAN: UK AND US; FRENCH: BELGIUM AND CANADA; GERMAN:
FRG AND DENMARK.

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03684 06 OF 08 051848 Z

30. KHLESTOV THEN SAID THAT THE PROCEDURAL AND PARTICIPATION
PACKAGE WOULD HAVE TO BE PREPARED IN THE FOUR LANGUAGES IN
DRAFT BEFORE THE FIRST PLENARY, AND THAT COPIES OF THE
CHAIRMAN'S RECORD WOULD NEED TO BE AVAILABLE TO ALL
DELEGATIONS. HE SUGGESTED THAT PERHAPS THE TRANSLATIONS

COMMITTEE COULD DECIDE WHO WOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR
HAVING COPIES AVAILABLE. THE US REP AGREED.

31. KHLESTOV THEN SAID THE EAST SIDE WAS READY AT THIS POINT
TO AGREE FORMALLY TO ARRANGEMENTS ON PUBLICITY AS EARLIER
DISCUSSED, I. E., THAT THE PLENARY MEETING WOULD BE CLOSED; THAT
PRESS REPRESENTATIVES WOULD BE PERMITTED TO TAKE PHOTOGRAPHS
WHILE ORAL PROCEEDINGS WERE NOT UNDERWAY; AND THAT EACH
SIDE COULD PUBLICIZE THE RECORD OF THE FIRST PLENARY, ALONG
WITH THEIR COMMENTS ON IT. THE US REP INDICATED ALLIED
AGREEMENT.

32. KHLESTOV RAISED THE QUESTION OF INTERPRETATION, SUGGESTING
THAT INTERPRETERS SHOULD ONLY READ OFF THE WRITTEN TEXT FROM
THE AGREED TRANSLATIONS, WITH NO IMPORVISATIONS. THE US
REP AGREED AD REFERENDUM TO ALLIES.

33. KHLESTOV THEN SAID THAT THE MATTER WAS NOW SOMEWHAT
THEORETICAL, BUT THE EAST HAD ENVISAGED HOLDING THE FIRST
PLENARY ON THURSDAY, MAY 10, AT 3:00 P. M. THE NEXT
MEETING COULD BE ON FRIDAY, MAY 11 AT 10:30 A. M., AT WHICH
TIME GENERAL STATEMENTS WOULD BE MADE, AND A THIRD SESSION
COULD BE HELD ON MONDAY, MAY 14. IF THIS SCHEDULE WERE
FEASIBLE, THE AUSTRIAN AUTHORITIES AND THE PRESS SHOULD BE
INFORMED ON MAY 8 ABOUT THE FIRST PLENARY, AND THAT THE
AUSTRIANS MIGHT MAKE THE ANNOUNCEMENT FOR THE PRESS.

34. THE US REP SAID THAT INFORMING THE PRESS WOULD BE AN
EASY MATTER WHICH COULD BE EFFECTED BY SPOKESMEN FOR THE
TWO SIDES IN THE HOFBURG PRESS CENTER. THIS SHOULD BE A
SIMPLE PROCEDURE, WITH THE SPOKESMEN FOR BOTH SIDES
DECLINING TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS EXCEPT FOR A POSSIBLE
QUESTION ON WHY THE LOCUS OF THE MEETING HAD SHIFTED FROM
THE HOFBURG TO THE IAEA. WHICH THE ANSWER SHOULD BE THAT
THIS FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF THE AUSTRIAN GOVERNMENT.

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03684 06 OF 08 051848 Z

KHLESTOV SAID THIS SEEMED REASONABLE, BUT HE WOULD LIKE TO
CONSIDER IT FURTHER.

35. KHLESTOV THEN HANDED OVER A PROPOSED TEXT ANNOUNCING
THAT PLENARIES WOULD BE HELD. BEGIN TEXT. " AS AGREED BY THE
DELEGATIONS OF 19 COUNTRIES WHICH ARE PARTICIPATING IN THE
PREPARATORY CONSULTATIONS RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE THAT BEGAN
IN VIENNA ON 31 JANUARY 1973, A PLENARY MEETING WILL BE HELD ON
MAY 1973 AT . THE MEETING WILL TAKE PLACE AT
THE HEADQUARTERS OF THE IAEA, KARTNER RING II". END TEXT.

36. THE US REP SAID THIS TEXT WAS CLOSE TO ALLIED THINKING,
AND THAT THE ALLIES WOULD PREFER TO DESCRIBE THE PLENARY
AS AN INITIAL PLENARY. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE MEETING OF
JANUARY 31 WAS ALSO A PLENARY, AND THAT THE US REP SUGGESTION

WOULD DOWNGRADE THIS FACT. THE US REP SAID THAT THE FIRST MEETING WAS A " CONSTITUTIVE" MEETING. TIMERBAYEV SAID THAT THE EAST DID NOT WANT TO GIVE THE IMPLICATION THAT WORK IN VIENNA WAS ONLY NOW STARTING. KHLESTOV SAID THAT FORMULATION " A PLENARY" WAS NEUTRAL AND DID NOT SUGGEST WHETHER IT WAS THE FIRST OR SECOND. THE US REP SAID THAT THE ALLIED REPS WOULD TAKE THESE VIEWS UNDER ADVISEMENT. HE THEN READ THE TEXT OF THE ALLIED DRAFT AS DEVELOPED IN THE AD HOC GROUP. " THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE 19 STATES WHO ARE PARTICIPANTS IN THE PREPARATORY CONSULTATIONS RELATING TO CENTRAL EUROPE WHICH BEGAN IN VIENNA ON 31 JANUARY 1973 WILL HOLD AN INITIAL PLENARY MEETING IN THE BOARD ROOM OF THE IAEA ON MAY ... AT .." HE NOTED THAT THE TWO TEXTS WERE SIMILAR AND SHOULD BE EASY TO RECONCILE.

37. TURNING TO THE SUBJECT OF THE COMMUNIQUE TO BE ISSUED AFTER THE FIRST PLENARY, THE US REP NOTED THAT THERE WERE CONSIDERABLE SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE IDEAS OF BOTH SIDES, AND PRESENTED A PROPOSED ALLIED TEXT AS DEVELOPED IN THE AD HOC GROUP. BEGIN TEXT.

" REPRESENTATIVES OF THE 19 STATES WHO ARE THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE PREPARATORY CONSULTATIONS RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE WHICH BEGAN IN VIENNA ON 31 JANUARY 1973 MET IN PLENARY SESSION ON MAY ... UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF

SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 03684 06 OF 08 051848 Z

" THE REPRESENTATIVES ADOPTED AN ARRANGEMENT ON PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES TO BE APPLIED BOTH IN THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS AND IN THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS.

" THE REPRESENTATIVES CONCLUDED THAT THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS HAVE PROCEEDED IN A BUSINESS- LIKE AND CONSTRUCTIVE ATMOSPHERE WHICH CREATES FAVORABLE PROSPECTS FOR THE SUCCESSFUL SOLUTION OF THE REMAINING QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE PREPARATION OF THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS.

" THE REPRESENTATIVES REQUESTED THE CHAIRMAN TO THANK THE AUSTRIAN AUTHORITIES IN THEIR NAME FOR THE CONSIDERATE ASSISTANCE AND FACILITIES THEY ARE PROVIDING.

" THE EXT PLENARY SESSION WILL BE HELD ON MAY.....
END TEXT.

38. US REP THEN NOTED THAT THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF THE ALLIED TEXT, EMBODYING THE IDEA OF CARRY OVER, COULD

SECRET

NMAFVVZCZADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03684 07 OF 08 051904 Z

44

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 USIA-12

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 SS-15 NSC-10 AEC-11 OIC-04 ACDA-19 H-02

RSR-01 OMB-01 /155 W

----- 117404

P R 051614 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8699

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 386

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

S E C R E T SECTION 7 OF 8 VIENNA 3684

GENEVA FOR DISTO

OBVIATE THE NEED FOR STATEMENTS ON THIS SUBJECT. KHLESTOV DISAGREED, SAYING THAT THE COMMUNIQUE SHOULD BE SIMPLE AND OF AN INFORMATIONAL NATURE ONLY. THE US REP SAID IN THIS CASE, THIS PARAGRAPH COULD READ " THE REPRESENTATIVES ADOPTED AN ARRANGEMENT ON PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES," WHICH WOULD REPRESENT AS A WHOLLY NEUTRAL FORMULATION. KHLESTOV SAID HE SAW NO NEED TO TIE THE QUESTION OF PROCEDURES IN WITH THE COMMUNIQUE. UPON BEING REMINDED THAT THIS IDEA WAS ALSO EMOBIDED IN THE SOVIET TEXT EARLIER GIVEN TO THE ALLIED REPS, HE SAID THAT THE ABBREVIATED PARAGRAPH READ BY THE US REP SEEMED REASONABLE, BUT THAT HE WOULD HAVE TO CONFIRM ON THIS POINT.

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03684 07 OF 08 051904 Z

39. TURNING TO OTHER ORGANIZATIONAL QUESTIONS, KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE EAST COULD CONFIRM THAT THE FIRST CHAIRMAN SHOULD BE CHOSEN BY LOT BY THE POLISH AND BELGIAN REPRESENTATIVES. IF THE TIMETABLE HE HAD EARLIER SPELLED OUT WERE A REALISTIC ONE, THIS COULD BE DONE ON MAY 7 SO AS TO GIVE THE CHAIRMAN ADVANCE WARNING. THE US REP SAID THAT ADVANCE DRAWING WOULD BE REASONABLE.

KHLESTOV WENT ON FURTHER TO CONFIRM THE EASTERN UNDERSTANDING THAT IF THE CHAIRMAN WERE FROM THE EASTERN SIDE, THE 9 PROCEDURAL POINTS WOULD BE READ BY EITHER THE NETHERLANDS OR US REP, WITH A DIFFERENT ALLIED REP MAKING THE ALLIED STATEMENT ON HUNGARY FROM THE ONE PRESENTING THE 9 PROCEDURAL POINTS. IF THE CHAIRMAN WERE FROM THE ALLIED SIDE, HE, KHLESTOV, WOULD PRESENT THE NINE POINT. HE SAID THAT IT WOULD ALSO BE NECESSARY TO DECIDE WHICH REPRESENTATIVES WOULD READ THE STATEMENTS ON CARRY OVER, AND THAT IN ANY CASE THESE SHOULD BE DIFFERENT REPS THAN THE SPEAKERS SELECTED FOR THE OTHER TASKS HE HAD ENUMERATED. THE US REP SAID THIS DECISION WAS A SIMPLE ONE; THE REAL PROBLEM WAS WITH HOW THE STATEMENTS ON CARRY OVER SHOULD BE MADE.

40. KHLESTOV THEN SAID THAT THE EAST COULD ACCEPT ALLIED VIEWS ON THE FUNCTIONS OF THE CHAIRMAN, I. E.: TO OPEN AND CLOSE SESSIONS; TO RECOGNIZE SPEAKERS; TO RECOGNIZE CONSENSUS; AFTER CONSULTING WITH OTHER DELEGATIONS, TO SUGGEST DATE AND AGENDA FOR NEXT SESSIONS, (TIMBERBAYEV ADDED THAT THE LAST FUNCTION WOULD OF COURSE ONLY BE PERFORMED WHEN THERE WAS AGREEMENT ON THE NEXT SESSION AND/ OR AGENDA.); TO ISSUE AGREED STATEMENTS; AND TO CARRY OUT OTHER FUNCTIONS AS AGREED TO AMONG THE PARTICIPANTS.

41. THE US REP SAID THAT IT WAS OBVIOUS THAT THE TWO SIDES WERE CLOSE TO AGREEMENT WITH THE EXCEPTION OF ONE MAJOR QUESTION: STATEMENTS ON CARRY OVER INCLUDING MENTION OF OBSERVERS. THE EASTERN SIDE WANTED SUCH STATEMENTS TO BE MADE IN THE FIRST PLENARY. THE ALLIES WISHED THEM TO BE MADE ORALLY IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE PRESENT GROUP. BY THE LATTER ARRANGEMENT, THE EAST WOULD BE FREE TO PUBLICIZE THE CONTENT OF THE STATEMENTS AS IT JUDGED APPROPRIATE AS WOULD THE ALLIED SIDE. BOTH SIDES SHOULD NOW THINK ON WAYS TO RESOLVE THIS ISSUE.

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03684 07 OF 08 051904 Z

42. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE EASTERN VIEW WAS CLEAR-- THE STATEMENTS MUST BE A MATTER OF RECORD.. HE SAW NO POSSIBILITY TO COMPROMISE ON THIS POINT. HE COULD HOWEVER ENVISAGE ONE OTHER WAY TO APPROACH THE ISSUE-- TO PLACE THE STATEMENTS ON CARRY OVER IN THE RECORD AFTER THE CHAIRMAN HAD ASKED FOR OBJECTIONS TO PREVIOUS DISCUSSION, ANNOUNCED THAT THERE WERE NO OBJECTIONS, AND BEFORE HIS FINAL REMARK THAT " IT WILL BE SO RECORDED." THE US REP WONDERED IF HE HAD UNDERSTOOD KHLESTOV CORRECTLY TO SAY THAT THE STATEMENTS SHOULD COME AFTER THE CHAIRMAN'S FINAL REMARKS, AND SHOULD NOT BE PART OF THE RECORD. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THEY HAD TO BE A PART OF THE RECORD,

ALTHOUGH THE CHAIRMAN COULDS SAY, " IT WILL BE SO RECORDED"
AS REGARDS THE PROCEDURES PACKAGE, THEN HEAR THE STATE-
MENTS ON CARRYOVER, AND THEN SAY, " IT WILL BE SO RECORDED,"
A SECOND TIME. IN ANY CASE, IT WOULD NOT BE POSSIBLE TO
ENVISAGE THESE STATEMENTS AS A PURELY ORAL EXCHANGE
MADE DURING THE FIRST PLENARY. KHLESTOV SAID HE COULD
ENVISAGE A SECOND POSSIBILITY. IN THE BEGINNING OF THE
PLENARY, THE CHAIRMAN WOULD SAY THAT HE UNDERSTOOD THAT
THERE WOULD BE TWO STATEMENTS MADE. HE WOULD THEN SAY
" THEN WE WILL HEAR TWO OTHER STATEMENTS", THEN THE SCENARIO
HE HAD JUST OUTLINED WOULD APPLY. THE US REP SAID HE
DID NOT BELIEVE THIS WAS APRODUCTIVE LINE OF DISCUSSION.

43. THE US REP SAID THAT WITHOUT WISHING TO RETURN
NOW TO THE QUESTION OF THE STATUS OF THE PROPOSED EX-
CHANGE OF STATMENTS ON CARRY OVER, WHERE THERE WAS A
CLEAR IMPASSE, HE WANTED TO BE SURE THERE WAS CLARITY
ON THE EXACT TEXT. HE SUGGESTED THAT, IN THE SECOND
SENTENCE, WHICH NOW READ " THIS DOES NOT EXCLUDE
THE POSSIBILITY OF OUR RAISING THE QUESTION OF INVITING
OTHER EUROPEAN STATES TO PARTICIPATE IN THESE NEGOTIA-
TIONS AS OBSERVES," THE WORD " PRECLUDE" MIGHT BE MORE
APPROPRIATE THAN " EXCLUDE" AND ALSO THAT THE ALLIES WOULD
PREFER THAT THE WORD " OUR" BE DROPPED. KHLESTOV SAID
THAT THESE SEEMED REASONABLE CHANGES, PROVIDING THAT THE
SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 03684 07 OF 08 051904 Z

STATEMENT WERE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD. THE US REP
SAID THT HE HAD ALREADY PROPOSED AN AMENDMENT TO THE DRAFT
ALLIED STATEMENT TO THE EFFECT THAT THE WORDS " IN ITS
PRESENT FORM UNLESS ADDED TO BY CONSENSUS" BE REPLACED
BY THE PHRASE " WITHOUT FURTHER REQUIREMENTS AND CONDITIONS
ON EITHER SIDE." KHLESTOV HAD NOT EXPRESSED AGREEMENT TO
THE SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE. IN THAT EVENT, THE ALLIES WOULD
NONETHELESS WISH TO DROP THE PHRASE " IN ITS PRESENT
FORM UNLESS ADDED TO BY CONSENSUS" SINCE KHLESTOV HIMSELF
AGREED THE PHRASE WAS SUPERFLOUES. A CORRESPONDING
CHANGE SHOULD BE MADE IN THE EASTERN REPLY. KHLESTOV
SAID HE WOULD CONSIDER THIS AMENDMENT FAVORABLY IF THE
STATEMENT WERE TO BE MADE A PART OF THE RECORD.

SECRET
NMAFVVZCZADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 03684 08 OF 08 051922 Z

44
ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 INR-10 L-03

NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 USIA-12

TRSE-00 SAJ-01 SS-15 NSC-10 AEC-11 OIC-04 ACDA-19 H-02

RSR-01 OMB-01 /155 W

----- 117472

P R 051614 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8700

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 387

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

S E C R E T SECTION 8 OF 8 VIENNA 3684

44. KHLESTOV THEN SAID THAT IF THE ALLIES CONTINUED TO OPPOSE INCLUDING THIS STATMENT IN THE RECORD OF THE FIRST SESSION, A WAY OUT OF THE PRESENT IMPASSE WOULD SIMPLY NOT BE POSSIBLE. THE EASTERN SIDE HAD DONE ITS MAXIMUM. THE UK REP SAID THAT HE AND THE NETHERLANDS REP HAD MADE ABUNDANTLY CLEAR THAT THIS SOVIET DEMAND POSED SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR THE ALLIES. HE ADVISED THE EASTERN SIDE TO THINK THE MATTER OVER CAREFULLY WITH THE AIM OF FINDING A SOLUTION AND TO LET THE ALLIES KNOW IF THEY HAD NEW IDEAS.

45. FOLLOWING ARE TEXTS WHICH EMERGED FROM THE SESSION OF MAY 4, 1973, WITH SOVIETS AND HUNGARIANS.

II. EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS ON CARRY OVER.

ALLIED SPOKESMAN:

" IT IS UNDERSTOOD THAT THE ARRANGEMENT ON SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 03684 08 OF 08 051922 Z

PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES BEING ADOPTED TODAY WILL ALSO BE APPLIED IN THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS."

EASTERN SPOKESMAN:

" IT IS AGREED THAT THE ARRANGEMENT ON PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES BEING ADOPTED TODAY WILL ALSO BE APPLIED IN THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS. THIS DOES NOT PRECLUDE THE POSSIBILITY OF RAISING THE QUESTION OF INVITING OTHER EUROPEAN STATES TO PARTICIPATE IN THESE NEGOTIATIONS AS OBSERVERS."

II. ORAL ALLIED STATEMENT ON WORKING GROUPS TO BE MADE IN QUADRILATERAL SESSION.

" THE WESTERN DELEGATIONS WILL NOT OBJECT ON PROCEDURAL GROUNDS IF, DURING THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS, YOU WISH TO RAISE THE QUESTION OF ESTA-

BLISHING WORKING GROUPS FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS, IT
BEING UNDERSTOOD THAT THIS QUESTION WOULD BE
DECIDED BY CONSENSUS (EITHER IN THESE CONSULTATIONS
OR IN THE NEGOTIATIONS)." (BRACKETED PHRASE ONT
YET AGREED.)

III. COMMUNIQUE TO ANNOUNCE PLEINARY.

(TEXT NOT YET FINALLY AGREED.)

" REPRESENTATIVES OF THE 19 STATES PARTI-
CIPATING IN THE PREPARATORY CONSULTATIONS RELATED
TO CENTRAL EUROPE WHICH BEGAN IN VIENNA ON 31
JANUARY 1973 WILL HOLD A (N INITIAL) PLENARY MEETING
IN THE BOARDROOM OF THE IAEA BUILDING ON MAY -----
AT --(TIME)--.
(SOVIETS HAVE OBJECTED TO THE THE WORD " INITIAL" AND HAVE
PROPOSED SLIGHTLY DIFFERENNT WORDING.)

IV. COMMUNIQUE FOR ISSUANCE FOLLOWING FIRST
PLENARY MEETING.

(TEXT NOT YET FINALLY AGREED.)

" REPRESENTATIVES OF THE 19 STATES WHO ARE THE
PARTICIPANTS IN THE PREPARATORY COSULTATIONS
RELATED TO CENTRAL EUROPE WHICH BEGAN IN VIENNA
ON 31 JANUARY 1973 MET IN PLENARY SESSION ON
MAY----- UNDER THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF -----.

" THE REPRESENTATIVES ADOPTED AN ARRANGEMENT
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 03684 08 OF 08 051922 Z

ON PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES (TO BE APPLIED
ON PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES (TO BE APPLIED
BOTH IN THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS AND IN THE
FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS).

" THE REPRESENTATIVES CONCLUDED THAT THE PRESENT
CONSULTATIONS HAVE PROCEEDED IN A BUSINESS- LIKE
AND CONTRUCTIVE ATMOSPHERE WHICH CREATES FAVORABLE
PROSPECTS FOR THE SUCCESSFUL SOLUTION OF THE
REMAINING QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE PREPARATION OF
THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS.

" THE REPRESENTATVIES REQUESTED THE CHAIRMAN
TO THANK THE AUSTRIAN AUTHORITIES IN THEIR NAME
FOR THE CONSIDERATE ASSISTANCE AND FACILITIES
THEY ARE PROVIDING.

" THE NEXT PLENARY SESSION WILL BE HELD ON
MAY-----."

END TEXTS.
HUMES

SECRET

NMAFVVZCZ

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 10 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 05 MAY 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973VIENNA03684
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730560/abqcellx.tel
Line Count: 1130
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION MBF
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 21
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 29 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <29-Aug-2001 by freemaal>; APPROVED <29-Oct-2001 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> mcm 971212
Subject: MAY 4 DISCUSSION BETWEEN NETHERLANDS AND US REPS AND SOVIET AND HUNGARIAN REPS
TAGS: PARM
To: STATE INFO SECDEF
MBFR CAPITALS
GENEVA
USNMR SHAPE
USLOSACLANT
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH

SALT TWO II

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005